



Virginia Department of Emergency Management

STAFF BRIEFING FORM

DATE	1/06/2021
TO	Curtis Brown and Erin Sutton
THROUGH	Dorothy Spears-Dean
FROM	9-1-1 Services Board
TYPE OF ISSUE	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. For awareness2. Signature3. Decision4. Guidance / review5. MOU6. Meeting request
BRIEF DESCRIPTION	<p>During the November 12, 2020 meeting of the 9-1-1 Services Board (the "Board"), members directed the 9-1-1 and Geospatial (NGS) Bureau Chief to prepare a decision brief for a 9-1-1 Cost Study. The resulting study will generate an analysis of local 9-1-1 costs and make recommendations related to future revenue and funding strategies. In Virginia, 9-1-1 is a local response. The Board needs this report to make informed decisions about future revenue and funding methodologies, for which it is responsible, as well as to minimize NG9-1-1 sustainment costs. Localities need analysis to understand the short- and long-term impacts. Board members will review and act on this brief at the January 14, 2021 meeting.</p>
PRIORITY	<p>(See Eisenhower Matrix; select only one category below)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Important & Urgent – do first2. Important & Less Urgent – schedule3. Less Important & Urgent – delegate4. Less Important & Less Urgent – stop doing
STRATEGIC ROADMAP ALIGNMENT	<p>(See Strategic Roadmap; select the one that most closely aligns)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Integrate equity and prioritize those most-at-risk into all programs2. Creatively enhance agency capacity3. Grow inclusive, collaborative, and diverse environment4. Ensure a trained and ready team5. Strengthen and create new partnerships

TEAM	<p>(DACI model)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Driver – Dorothy 2. Approver – Curtis or Erin (VDEM)/9-1-1 Services Board 3. Contributor – NGS Bureau 4. Informed – NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee/PSAP community
TIMELINE	As soon as possible.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary: <p>The purpose of the study is to determine the statewide cost of 9-1-1 in Virginia, identify potential efficiency improvements, determine adequacy of current revenue stream, and short- and long-term impacts on localities. The Board recommended the formation of a committee to provide recommendations on NG9-1-1 recurring costs. The NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee, a NGS Bureau committee, purports that local 9-1-1 expenses are increasing much more rapidly than the Wireless E-911 Fund. This study should determine statewide 9-1-1 costs, and trends related to these costs, through an analysis of primary PSAP operational expenses over the past five fiscal years. It should also include projections or recommendations on future NG9-1-1 costs and investment requirements, as well as anticipated trends. The Board is particularly interested in strategies to establish an equity-based approach to statewide funding that utilizes metrics and criteria for determining most at-risk PSAPs.</p> <p>An existing funding methodology determines the amount of payment made to primary PSAP from the Wireless E-911 Fund. This funding formula includes only two determinants: total 9-1-1 calls and population. This study should include recommendations related to the wireless funding formula that will be recalculated effective July 1, 2023.</p> 2. Additional facts needed to describe the issue or scenario: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Currently there are difficulties in collecting and comparing cost data such as, but not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inconsistent services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the PSAP answer 911 and administrative lines ▪ Does the PSAP manage the NCIC/VCIN entries ○ Variations in budget methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are facility costs included in the budget ▪ Regional MOUs for services ▪ Are compensation positions included in the budget ▪ If consolidated, does the budget include full costs or only the fiscal agent’s portion of the costs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Different organization models <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there secondary PSAP's that handle 9-1-1 services (e.g. Dispatch) b. The cost study must be able to present costs in a manner to provide transparency to the inconsistencies. c. Additionally, the study should not only collect operating expenses, but should also include capital expenditures and any payments made through regional MOUs among localities. d. The Board only has visibility into payments made from the wireless E-911 Fund, but local governments receive funding from other sources. These other sources include Compensation Board, Communications Sales and Use Tax (CSUT), and regional and local funding. In order to have an understanding of the total cost of supporting 9-1-1, insight is needed into these other funding sources. e. Carriers represent an important stakeholder group and representatives of this group must be invited to participate in the study since they are directly involved in surcharge collection. f. Also, include matrix approach to stakeholder involvement beyond carrier community. <p>Assumptions (if needed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Agency desires to leverage 9-1-1 Services Board's best practice of utilizing VITA's IT Contingent Labor contract. b. Engagement method would be "Statement of Work" c. The study will require a minimum of six months to complete.
<p>BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost: Proposals will provide actual cost, but anticipate a cost range of 200K to 250K. 2. Financial Management Bureau approved on: 3. Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Already budgeted b. Not budgeted; funding available (Wireless E-911 Fund) c. Not budgeted; funding not available, but still need to move forward (if you choose this option, please provide additional details on why this is a critical issue)

COURSES OF ACTION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restraints/limitations - NGS Bureau does not have resources to complete study. 2. Other actions available – Board continues to make decisions with limited fiscal analysis and information. 3. Evaluation of all actions considered - take action recommended 4. Summary of recommended course of action - approve study
OTHER	Attachments, contracts, MOU, etc. (None)